



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the decision is wrong, for the English theory is that a chose in action is situated at the debtor's residence for purposes of probate duty; so the right against the surviving partner in England is an English asset. *In re Smyth*, [1898] 1 Ch. 89. But by the mercantile view the partnership assets are owned by the firm as an entity. *Hopkins v. Baker Bros. & Co.*, 78 Md. 363; *Pratt v. McGuinness*, 173 Mass. 170. The right of action is against this entity which is a New South Wales firm, as its business is in that country. *Laidlay v. Lord Advocate*, 15 App. Cas. 468. Hence the decision that the right is a New South Wales asset is in line with the modern authorities which, while not openly and courageously adopting the mercantile theory, reach results that can be justified on no other basis. See 57 Cent. L. J. 343; 17 HARV. L. REV. 207.

PARTY WALLS — COMPENSATION FOR USE IN THE ABSENCE OF AGREEMENT. — On enlarging his store, an owner of land built the exterior wall half on his own and half on the adjoining lot, without permission or agreement to divide the expense. Both lots were sold, and the vendee of the adjoining owner in building made use of that part of the wall which was on his land. *Held*, that the vendee of the builder of the wall can recover the value of the use made of the wall. *Spaulding v. Grundy*, 104 S. W. 293 (Ky.).

On facts similar to these, the builder of the wall has uniformly been denied the right to proportionate contribution to the cost of erection from the adjoining owner or his grantee, who makes use of the wall. *Preiss v. Parker*, 67 Ala. 500; *List v. Hornbrook*, 2 W. Va. 340. Recovery limited to the value of the use actually made has been sanctioned in only one case. See *Sanders v. Martin*, 2 Lea (Tenn.) 213; *contra*, *Sherred v. Cisco*, 4 Sandf. (N. Y.) 480. Whether the recovery be measured by the builder's outlay or by the value of the use of that which the adjoining owner never authorized to be put on his land, the latter is arbitrarily forced to pay for using part of his own land, in the alternative of suffering a diminution in its size or of adopting his remedy of self-help, which would cause needlessly great injury. *Wigford v. Gill*, Cro. Eliz. 269; see *Sherred v. Cisco*, *supra*, 489. Moreover, the builder of the wall is amply protected by estoppel, if it appear that he was reasonable in assuming a promise by the adjoining owner to pay if he used the wall. *Day v. Caton*, 119 Mass. 513. In the case discussed there appears to be no basis for such an assumption; consequently the result seems unwarranted.

POWERS—DEFECTIVE APPOINTMENT—WHEN EQUITY WILL REAPPOINT. — The testatrix bequeathed property to her husband to appoint "\$4,000 to my mother's family and the balance to my father's family in such manner as he thinks proper." The donee of the power appointed \$4,500 to the mother's family. *Held*, that the appointment is void and that the court cannot appoint the property. *In re Roger's Estate*, 67 Atl. 762 (Pa.).

Where the donee of the power is not required to exercise it, equity will make no appointment. See *Brown v. Higgs*, 8 Ves. Jr. 561. But in the present case it seems clear that no discretion was given. The court, while recognizing that the property is held in trust, calls it a trust for the donor. This seems erroneous, as the trust should be for the beneficiaries. See *Brown v. Higgs*, *supra*. Where the power is to be exercised for a definite class with no power of exclusion, and members of that class are excluded, equity distributes equally to the entire class. *Kemp v. Kemp*, 5 Ves. Jr. 849. Moreover, it is held that where the power is to be exercised for "relations" with power of exclusion, all the "relations" are *cestuis*, and, on a failure to exercise the power, the next of kin will take. *Harding v. Glyn*, 1 Atk. 469. Where there has been an attempt to appoint too much, as in the present case, it has been held that the last appointees lose their share. *Trollope v. Routledge*, 1 De G. & Sm. 662. This last decision was based on the intention of the donee. In the present case, however, since no preference seems intended, a *pro rata* distribution among the appointees seems desirable on the analogy of the abatement of legacies.

SALES — SALE OF GOODS ACT — EFFECT OF TENDER OF PAYMENT ON VERBAL AGREEMENT. — The plaintiff orally agreed to purchase goods exceed-